DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 820 TM 018 042

AUTHOR Smolen, Lynn; Newman, Carole
TITLE Portfolios: An Estimate of Their Validity and Practicality.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (15th, Hilton Head, SC, March 5-9, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Measures; Beginning Teachers; *College Students; Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Interviews; Higher Education; Mail Surveys; *Personnel Directors; Personnel Selection; *Portfolios (Background Materials); Preservice Teacher Education; *Principals; Student Developed Materials; Student Evaluation; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Performance Based Evaluation

ABSTRACT

As part of a research project about portfolios as a means of assessment for preservice teachers, the College of Education at a midwestern university formed a committee to review and rate student-developed portfolios. The committee evaluated student portfolios both for their evidence of attainment of beginning teacher competencies and also for their professional appearance. The committee surveyed 8 principals, 6 personnel directors, 5 curriculum directors, 15 assistant superintendents, 17 superintendents, and 10 persons with unidentified positions from 61 school districts employing the university's graduates, to study the usefulness of portfolios as interview tools. The idea was generally well received, with 50 of the respondents willing, 10 possibly willing, and 1 unwilling to look at an applicant's portfolio. Personnel directors were least willing to use portfolios. Principals were more interested than others in hard evidence of classroom skills, with interest in lesson plans, tests, classroom management, student discipline statements, and evidence of computer skills. Assistant superintendents and superintendents were more interested in focusing on recommendations of other professionals who had previously examined the candidates. Surveys of wider samples of administrators should clarify the portfolios' reliability. The 29-item College of Education Portfolio Survey, 5 tables, and a 15-item list of references are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LYNN SMOLEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED342820

PORTFOLIOS: AN ESTIMATE OF THEIR VALIDITY AND PRACTICALITY

Lynn Smolen, Ph.D.

and

Carole Newman, Ph.D.

The University of Akron

Presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, South Carolina, March 7, 1992.

TM018042

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Portfolios: An Estimate of Their Validity and Practicality

Today, as a result of the A Nation At Risk Report, and other similar action papers, there has been a national call for educational reform. Part of the response to this call for reform has been an effort to "define bold, new standards of teaching excellence and a process by which a teacher would demonstrate that he or she has met these standards" (Collins, 1990).

Experts (Bird, 1988; Scriven, 1988; Shulman and Sykes, 1986) argue that conventional methods of assessing teaching, such as multiple-choice tests, are inadequate to get a true picture of an individual's ability to teach since they fail to accurately portray the interrelationship of a teacher's content knowledge and his/her pedagogical expertise and student diversity in the classroom. Darling-Hammond (1988) has criticized teacher observation instruments for being piecemeal and insensitive to differences in contextual factors in the classroom. Shulman (1987) has pointed out that observation instruments do not account for "differences in context attributable to the subject matter being taught or the age or level of the learners." Shulman (1988) has called for a combination of methods--portfolios, direct observation, assessment centers, and better tests--to reflect the richness and complexity of teaching.

Portfolios are considered useful because they are performance-based and can reflect the context in which teaching occurs as well as an individual's personal history of teaching (Wolf, 1991). Universities across the country have begun to use

portfolios for the assessment of pre-service teachers (Geiger and Shugarman, 1988; Weinberger and Didham, 1987; Terry, Bachman, and Eade, 1983). Geiger and Shugarman (1988) have reported on the use of portfolios with preservice teachers at the University of Dayton in Ohio. At this institution, portfolios are used for evaluating knowledge, skills, and attitudes of individual students as well as the overall teacher education program. In the program evaluation, a sample of the students' portfolios is selected and the following questions are addressed:

What kinds of evidence do students include in their portfolios?

How do portfolios change over the four years?

What do the changes indicate about the program's success

Portfolios are also being used in school districts in different parts of the country. Connecticut, California, Georgia, and Tennessee are currently exploring how portfolios of classroom practices can form part of their evaluation of both beginning and career teachers (Furthwengler, 1985; and Terry and Eade, 1983).

A number of investigators have been exploring the usefulness of portfolios in teacher evaluation as well as how they should be structured and what they should contain (Vavrus and Collins, 1991; King, 1991; Shulman, Haertel and Bird, 1988). From 1986 to 1990, the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) at the Stanford University School of Education, under the leadership of Lee Shulman, conducted major research which explored alternative methods of teacher assessment. The long range goal of this project is to provide assessment guidelines which can be used in the future to select excellent teachers for national board certification. The

researchers explored three different forms of performance-based assessment: assessment center exercises, portfolios, and situated exercises (exercises derived from evidence from teachers' portfolios). There were two main phases of the research. The first phase investigated assessment center exercises and the second phase focused on portfolios. During the second phase, thirty elementary teachers of literacy and 20 high school biology teachers documented their teaching throughout the course of one year. They collected lesson plans, videotapes, samples of students' work, and their own reflective statements and placed these items in a portfolio (Wolf, 1991).

Findings from the TAP research showed (1) teachers can develop portfolios that reveal their actual teaching practices (2) explanations and reflective statements accompanying portfolio entries are a critical part of a portfolio and help to distinguish it from a scrapbook (3) developing a portfolio appears to encourage teachers to become more reflective about their own instructional practices (Vavrus & Collins, 1991; Wolf, 1991).

The TAP research also discovered some limitations to portfolios. They found that it was difficult for evaluators to avoid bias in judging a portfolio because the appearance could influence their judgment of the contents. Another concern was determining what was sufficient evidence to include in a portfolio. A third limita-tion was the issue of whether or not to provide highly structured directions for preparing a portfolio. Too little standardization could result in wide variability in the kinds of evidence and its organization in the portfolio. Too rigid guide-

lines could result in making a portfolio little more than a "school-based assessment center exercise" (Vavrus and Collins, 1991).

In a follow-up study, the TAP research team investigated how portfolios could be linked to assessment center exercises in an attempt to minimize the weaknesses of both assessment procedures. The researchers investigated linkages between the two, such as semi-structured interviews in which a teacher was asked to expand upon a portfolio entry to show her ability to adapt her teaching strategies to new situations. In summarizing this research, King (1991) recommends that one assessment center exercise be used with the evaluation of a teacher's portfolio to verify that he/she actually prepared the document and to serve as a bridge between specific teaching contexts and more generic teaching situations.

To date, little research has been done on the usefulness of a portfolio as an interview tool for a teaching position or on the perceptions of school administrators regarding this type of material. The current study will address these issues.

Methods and Data Source

As part of a research project to investigate the usefulness of portfolios as a means of assessment for preservice teachers, the College of Education at a midwestern university formed a committee to review and rate portfolios developed by students. This committee evaluated the portfolios in terms of whether or not the entries provided sufficient evidence of attainment of the 13

Beginning Teacher Competencies (BTCs) previously identified by the college. Portfolios were also judged for their professional appearance.

In addition to using portfolios as an assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired during the pre-professional training, the researchers investigated the usefulness of portfolios as an interview tool. Therefore, a survey was developed asking administrators to give their reactions to portfolios and their contents. This survey was sent to key administrators in the 65 surrounding school districts that accept the university's students for field experiences and/or student teaching placement. (See Appendix A for an example of this survey.) The data from the returned surveys were then analyzed and are reported in terms of the demographics, frequencies, cross tabs, and correlations.

Results

Administrators in 61 of the 65 school districts surveyed responded to the questionnaire. These administrators consisted of 8 building principals, 6 directors of personnel, 5 directors of curriculum, 15 assistant superintendents, and 17 superintendents. Ten of the respondents did not indicate their position within their system (see Table 1).

The idea of a portfolio as an interview tool was generally well received. Fifty (82%) of the respondents said they would be willing to look at an applicant's portfolio, 10 said they possibly would and only 1 was not willing to do so. Of those interested, approximately an equal number would be willing to review a portfolio before or during an interview, with very little interest in

an after interview review. As a group, only the directors of personnel were unreceptive to this tool. This becomes potentially important information if they are the ones who predominantly do the interviews and hiring in school districts.

Table 3 reports aggregated scores of the evidence administrators regard as "a must," "a must for some," "optional," or "of no interest." There appears to be a very high level of agreement among administrators that a professional resume (96.7%), student teaching evaluations (91.8%) and recommendations by school personnel (86.9%) are a must for all. Evidence that is generally of no interest or is considered to be optional includes unit plans, tests, non-print materials (puppets, etc.), pictures of teaching, audio and video tapes, term papers, and evidence of community and school volunteer service. It is interesting to note that in the previously described TAP portfolio research project, video tapes with accompanying teacher explanations and reflective statements about the contents were considered essential evidence of an individual's teaching skills (Wolf, 1991).

Upon closer examination of the data, different pattern emerged among administrative roles regarding the evidence they felt important for inclusion in the portfolio. Principals who were 100% in favor of using portfolios were generally willing to spend between 10-20 minutes viewing evidence of classroom skills. They were unanimously agreed that recommendations by school personnel, student teaching evaluations, lesson plans, and a philosophy of education statement were a must for all. Principals were also interested in viewing a unit plan, statements of class-

room management and student discipline, evidence of computer skills, as well as the interviewee's autobiography (see Table 4).

Only 16.7% of the directors of personnel said they would be willing to view a portfolio as part of the interview process (although 67% responded that they possibly would) and 83% said they would spend 5-15 minutes, maximum, doing so. These respondents all agreed that resumes were a must and were in generally high agreement (83%) that recommendations from school personnel, field and student teaching evaluations, lesson plans, as well as labels and explanations of portfolio evidence were a must. They were also the only administrative group generally interested (67%) in viewing evidence of community and school volunteer service (see Table 4).

Most of the directors of curriculum (80%) were willing to review portfolios for 3-15 minutes, with 20% willing to spend 30-60 minutes on this task. All of the administrators in this group felt a resume was a must, and 60% indicated that recommendations by school personnel, student teaching evaluations, and a philosophy of education were a must. They had no interest at all in unit plans, sample tests, audio tapes, academic papers, or in a classroom management plan, and only moderate interest (40%) in lesson plans and a student discipline plan. However, 80% of this group indicated that they would view a video tape of teaching, but they were generally not interested in the inclusion of more traditional types of evidence of successful teaching (see Table 4).

Of the assistant superintendents, 80% were willing to view portfolios with amounts of time ranging from 3 to 30 minutes.

Most of these administrators (93%) felt resumes were a must and indicated that it was important to include recommendations and evaluations. They also had little or no interest in the actual production of plans or materials by the interviewee (see Table 4).

Superintendents were the second most interested group of administrators in portfolios (88%). In general, they were willing to allocate 5-15 minutes in review, with 21% willing to spend between 30-60 minutes. Like the assistant superintendents, they were most interested in a resume, recommendations by school personnel and evaluations from student teaching and field experience. Seventy-one percent were also willing to view video tapes of teaching, if available (see Table 4). It is encouraging to see the superintendent interest in portfolios as an additional interview tool, but one must wonder if the interest and generous time expectations for portfolio review were in part because they are not likely to actually be involved in the interview process and can afford to be more idealistic in their estimations.

Inspection of the correlation matrix (Table 5) indicates some relationships in types of portfolio evidence that are correlated at or beyond the .05 alpha level. There is a consistent significant correlation among items selected by respondents who value the opinions of other professionals in education. These items that are positively correlated include recommendations by school personnel, student teaching evaluations, and field experience evaluations. These items were also negatively correlated with non-print evidence such as puppets and games, pictures of classroom teaching, bulletin boards and learning centers and with audio

tapes. (That is, if respondents rated one set as important for inclusion, they tended to rate the other as of no interest or optional).

Not surprisingly, a significant positive correlation was also found between wanting to see lesson plans and other evidence of classroom skills such as a classroom management plan, tests, and a unit plan. Additionally, a significant positive correlation was found to exist between including a statement of classroom management, a student discipline plan, and a philosophy of education statement. These correlations support what one would theoretically expect, and in that sense, one can regard them as being supportive of the accuracy of the interpretation of the data.

Conclusion-Discussion

Too often new ideas in the field of education generate an interest and excitement which result in widespread adoption before they are fully investigated. When it is discovered that they are flawed and are not the panacea educators had hoped, these ideas are frequently abandoned and we lose the valuable aspects that created the initial interest. In our age of accountability, educators are searching for improved methods to verify and assess levels of teaching competencies among college of education graduates. The use of portfolios is one method that has been suggested as potentially effective for teaching institutions as well as for those responsible for hiring the very best.

It is the researchers' position that before we can use a portfolio to assess teacher preparedness, we first must determine which materials will provide the most useful evidence of

competence. To do this, the researchers felt it necessary to go beyond the university walls to survey administrators who are likely to use the portfolio as part of the interview process. Preliminary results have indicated that not only are there certain types of evidence all administrators agree upon, but administrators holding different positions rate different types of evidence as important for inclusion. For instance, principals seem to be more interested than other administrators in "hard evidence" of classroom skills. They want to see the lesson and unit plans, the tests, classroom management, and student discipline statements, and evidence of computer skills. Assistant superintendents and superintendents, on the other hand, seem more interested in focusing on recommendations and judgments of other professionals who have previously evaluated the candidate. In addition, the surveyed directors of personnel seem to have very little interest in using portfolios at all.

Before decisions can be made as to what portfolios should contain and whether they will provide reviewers with a valid assessment tool, a wider sample of administrators must be surveyed to determine the reliability of the profiles reported in this study. Portfolios must also be placed in the hands of administrators for their inspection and evaluation of an actual product. In addition, portfolios may be perceived as either effective or ineffective, not because of what is in them, but because of a poor match between the contents and what the reviewer wants to see.

Therefore, we strongly recommend future studies which take these concerns into consideration before judgments about the usefulness of portfolios in the field can be made.

College of Education
Portfolio Survey

To be completed by an administrator responsible for hiring teachers in the district.

School District Name_____

Name_____ Title_____

Introduction

A portfolio in an album containing carefully selected materials, such as lesson plans, a statement of one's philosophy of education, samples of instructional materials, and pictures or tapes of a lesson taught. It is intended to give the employer evidence of an applicant's skills, attitudes and values which cannot be garnered from an application or resume alone. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how you, as an employer of prospective teachers, would use a portfolio, if it were available for a candidate.

Part 1. Use of a portfolio during an interview

1. Would you be willing to look at an applicant's portfolio when interviewing him/her for a job?

   ❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Possibly

2. If you were to review a portfolio, when would you most likely do it?

   ❑ Before the interview ❑ During the interview ❑ After the interview

3. Approximately how much time do you think you would spend reviewing an applicant's portfolio?

   _____

4. If available in the portfolio, would you listen to an audio tape? ❑ Yes ❑ No
   view a video tape? ❑ Yes ❑ No

Part 2. Contents of a portfolio

Listed below are various items that could be included in a portfolio. Please review them and indicate whether you feel that each should be included in all portfolios, should be included for some applicants but not all, could be optional, or would be of no interest to you when you are assessing an applicant.
Note: If an item would be useful for some applicants, indicate the grade level or subject.

Item	A Must for All	A Must for Some	Optional	Of No Interest
1. Professional Resume	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
2. Recommendations by School Personnel	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			

College of Education
Portfolio Survey

Item	A Must for All	A Must for Some	Optional	Of No Interest
3. Evaluations from Field Experience	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
4. Evaluations from Student Teaching	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
Sample Instructional Materials Developed by the Applicant				
5. Lesson Plan(s)	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
6. Unit Plan(s) ❑	❑	❑	❑	
	What grade/subject?_____			
7. Test	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
8. Non-print Materials e.g., Puppets, Felt board Characters, Games, Transparencies, Other Media	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
9. Pictures: Bulletin Boards, Learning Stations, etc.	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
Evidence of Teaching				
10. Video Tape of Teaching	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
11. Audio Tape of Teaching	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
12. Pictures of Classroom Teaching with Explanatory Captions	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
Evidence of Knowledge/Writing/Views of Teaching				
13. Term Paper Showing Knowledge in a Subject	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			
14. Statement of How A Teacher Should Set up a Classroom Management System	❑	❑	❑	❑
	What grade/subject?_____			

College of Education
Portfolio Survey

Item	A Must for All	A Must for Some	Optional	Of No Interest
15. Statement of Views Regarding Student Discipline and How to Plan for it	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
16. Evidence of Skill with Computer Technology	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
17. Statement of Personal Philosophy of Education	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
18. Autobiography	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
19. Letters or Other Evidence Showing Community Service	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
20. Letters or Other Evidence Showing Volunteer Work in the Schools	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
21. Would any other items be of interest to you? If so, please describe below.	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
_____	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑
_____	❑ What grade/subject?_____	❑	❑	❑

Part 3. Presentation of Portfolio

Some authorities have recommended that each item in a portfolio be labeled. Additionally, they have advised that there be an explanation and/or a statement reflecting upon each item. For example, a photograph of a group of students taking part in an activity may include a caption, an explanation of what is happening in the picture, and a reflection about the activity's importance and about what was learned from it.

Please indicate whether one or more of these would be of use to you when reviewing an applicant's portfolio.

1. Labels ❑ Useful for all items ❑ Useful for some items ❑ Nice, but not necessary
2. Explanation ❑ Useful for all items ❑ Useful for some items ❑ Nice, but not necessary
3. Reflection ❑ Useful for all items ❑ Useful for some items ❑ Nice, but not necessary

If you have any comments or suggestions regarding portfolios, please use the space below.

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

If you have any questions regarding this questionnaire
or the College of Education's plans to use portfolios,
please do not hesitate to contact us.

Lynn Smolen, Ph.D. or Carole Newman, Ph.D.
Department of Elementary Education
972-7756

Dale Whittington, Ph.D., Director
Assessment, Evaluation & Accreditation
972-5822

References

Bird, T. (1988). Teacher assessment and professionalization. Paper prepared for the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Collins, A. (1990). Novices, experts, veterans, and masters: The role of content and pedagogical knowledge in evaluating teaching. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). On teaching as a profession: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. Educational Leadership, 46, 11-15, 17.

Furthwengler, C. (1986). Multiple data sources in teacher evaluation. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education Conference.

Geiger, J., & Shugarman, S. (1988). Portfolios and case studies to evaluate teacher education students and programs. Action in Teacher Education, 10, 31-34.

King, B. (1991). Thinking about linking portfolios with assessment center exercises: Examples from the Teacher Assessment Project. Teacher Education Quarterly, 18, 31-48.

Scriven, M. (1988). Duties-based evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1(4).

Shulman, L. S. (1988). A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. Educational Leadership, 46, 36-41.

Shulman, L. S., Haertel, E., & Bird, T. (1988). Towards alternative assessments of teaching: A report of work in progress. (Technical Report 02). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, The Teacher Assessment Project.

Shulman, L. S., & Sykes, G. (1986). A national board for teaching? In search of a bold standard. Paper prepared for the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Terry, G., & Eade, G. (1983). The portfolio process: New roles for meeting challenges in professional development. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Conference.

Terry, G., Bachman, C., & Eade, G. (1983). The portfolio process in professional development. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Conference.

Vavrus, L., & Collins, A. (1991). Portfolio documentation and assessment center exercises: A marriage made for teacher assessment. Teacher Education Quarterly, 18, 13-29.

Weinberger, H., & Didham, C. (1987). Helping prospective teachers sell themselves: The portfolio as a marketing strategy. Association of Teacher Educators, 18(3).

Wolf, K. (1991). The schoolteacher's portfolio: Issues in design, implementation, and evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 129-136.

Table 1
Administrative Job Description of Respondents

Title	Frequency	Percent
Principal	8	15.7
Director of Personnel	6	11.8
Director of Curriculum	5	9.8
Assistant Superintendent	15	29.4
Superintendent	17	33.3

Note: 10 Respondents did not report their job title.

Table 2
Administrative Receptiveness to Portfolios as an Interview Tool

	%	(Frequency)
Willingness to look at portfolio:		
Yes	82.0	(50)
No	1.6	(1)
Possibly	16.4	(10)
Before Interview	40.0	(24)
During Interview	45.0	(27)
After Interview	15.0	(9)
Amount of Time would spent in Review:		
3-5 Minutes	16.7	(9)
5-10 Minutes	31.5	(17)
10-15 Minutes	27.8	(15)
15-20 Minutes	11.1	(6)
30-60 Minutes	13.0	(7)
Willingness to:		
Listen to audio tape	23.2	(13)
View a video tape	52.7	(29)

Formatting Conveniences for Included Evidence:

	Useful for all Items	Useful for some Items	Not Necessary
Labels (Each piece of evidence included)	55.0 (33)	30.0 (18)	15.0 (9)
Explanations (Caption describing evidence)	30.7 (18)	56.7 (34)	13.3 (8)
Reflection (Statement about importance of activity)	16.7 (10)	43.3 (26)	40.0 (24)

Note: See Appendix for the complete survey

Table 3
Administrators Perceptions of Various Types of Portfolio Evidence

Evidence to Include	% (Freq.) A must for All	% (Freq.) A must for Some	% (Freq.) Optional	%(Freq.) Of no Interest
Professional Resume	96.0 (58)	0.0 (0)	1.7 (1)	1.7 (1)
Recommendations from School Personnel	86.9 (53)	4.9 (3)	6.6 (4)	1.6 (1)
Evaluations from Field Experiences	75.0 (45)	10.0 (6)	10.0 (6)	5.0 (3)
Evaluations from Student Teaching	91.8 (56)	4.9 (3)	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)
Lesson Plan(s)	51.7 (31)	10.0 (6)	36.7 (22)	1.7 (1)
Unit Plan(s)	26.7 (16)	21.7 (13)	46.7 (28)	3.3 (2)
Test	23.3 (14)	11.7 (7)	53.3 (32)	10.0 (6)
Non-Print Materials (puppets, felt board characters, Games, Other Media)	3.3 (2)	16.7 (10)	58.3 (35)	18.3 (11)
Pictures: Bulletin Boards, Learning Stations, etc.	11.9 (7)	23.7 (14)	52.5 (31)	11.9 (7)
Video Tape of Teaching	19.7 (12)	13.1 (8)	47.5 (29)	18.0 (11)
Audio Tape of Teaching	3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	46.7 (28)	41.7 (25)
Pictures of Classroom Teaching with Explanatory Captions	13.1 (8)	4.9 (3)	59.0 (36)	21.3 (13)
Term Paper Showing Knowledge in a Subject	3.3 (2)	4.9 (3)	50.8 (31)	36.1 (22)
Classroom Management Plan	30.0 (18)	16.7 (10)	40.0 (24)	11.7 (7)
Views Regarding Plan for Student Discipline	50.8 (31)	14.8 (9)	26.2 (16)	6.6 (4)
Evidence of Skill in Computer Technology	29.5 (18)	31.1 (19)	37.1 (23)	1.6 (1)
Personal Philosophy of Education	57.4 (35)	9.8 (6)	24.6 (15)	6.6 (1)
Autobiography	42.6 (26)	3.3 (2)	49.2 (30)	4.9 (3)
Evidence of Community Service	21.3 (13)	8.2 (5)	67.2 (41)	3.3 (2)
Evidence of Volunteer Work in the Schools	16.4 (10)	11.5 (7)	70.5 (43)	1.6 (1)

Table 4
Profiles of Preferences of Evidence for Inclusion in Portfolios by Administrative Role

	Portfolio Evidence that *Must* be Included
Principals	
Willing to Review - 100%	Professional Resumes (100%)
Time Allocated:	Recommendation by School Personnel (100%)
10-20 min. (85%)	Philosophy of Education (100%)
30-60 min. (14%)	Student Teaching Evaluations (100%)
	Lesson Plans (100%)
	Student Discipline Plan (88%)
	Field Experience Evaluations (75%)
	Unit Plans (75%)
	Classroom Management Plan (63%)
	Computer Skills (63%)
	Autobiography (63%)
Directors of Personnel	
Willing to Review - 16.7%	Professional Resumes (100%)
Time Allocated:	Recommendation by School Personnel (83%)
3-15 min. (100%)	Student Teaching Evaluations (83%)
	Field Experience Evaluations (83%)
	Lesson Plans (83%)
	Labels on Evidence (83%)
	Community Service (67%)
	Volunteer Work in Schools (67%)
	Autobiography (67%)
	Unit Plans (60%)
	Explanation of Evidence (50%)

Table 4 Continued

	Portfolio Evidence that *Must* be Included
Directors of Curriculum	
Willing to Review - 80%	Professional Resumes (100%)
Time Allocated:	Student Teaching Evaluations (60%)
3-15 min. (80%)	Recommendation by School Personnel (60%)
30-60 min (20%)	Lesson Plans (40%)
	Field Experience Evaluations (40%)
	*Video - (20% must include
	but 80% would view if available)
Assistant Superintendent	
Willing to Review - 80%	Student Teaching Evaluations (100%)
Time Allocated:	Professional Resumes (93%)
3-5 min. (35%)	Recommendation by School Personnel (73%)
5-10, 10-15,	Field Experience Evaluations (71%)
15-20, 30-60	Labels on Evidence (67%)
About 15% Each	
Superintendent	
Willing to Review - 88%	Recommendation by School Personnel (94%)
Time Allocated:	Student Teaching Evaluations (94%)
5-15 min. (76%)	Professional Resumes (93%)
30-60 min. (20%)	Field Experience Evaluations (76%)
	Labels on Evidence (53%)
	*Video - (17% must include
	but 71% would view if available)

Note: Generally no interest was shown in non-print materials, lists, audio tapes, pictures of teaching, or academic papers.

Correlation of Administrative Questionaire Items

Questionnaire Item Numbers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1	1	-.27 .04 60		.26 .05 56																								
2		1		-.31 .02 55										.33 .01 58		-.34 .009 59	.26 .047 60		-.26 .045 59									
3			1	.30 .03 51												.30 .03 53												.26 .05 54
4				1	.43 .001 54											.41 .002 56												.35 .009 56
5					1										.59 .0001 55													
6						1								-.36 .006 58			-.38 .003 60						.25 .05 60			.27 .05 59		
7							1	.37 .004 60	.53 .0001 51				-.37 .004 60	-.26 .04 59														
8								1					-.26 .05 59															
9									1				-.43 .001 60	-.37 .004 59	-.34 .01 61		-.34 .007 61											
10										1	.65 .0001 59	.47 .0002 59							.35 .007 59			.27 .04 60						
11											1	.68 .0001 59							.26 .04 59	.27 .04 60	.36 .005 60							
12												1									.36 .004 60						.30 .02 59	
13													1	.26 .04 59			.39 .002 60											
14														1			.59 .0001 59		-.34 .01 58		.27 .04 59			.29 .02 59				

Table 5 Continued

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
15															1	.33 .01 60											.29 .03 60	
16																1						.30 .02 60						
17																	1				.28 .03 61							
18																		1	.43 .0007 60	.30 .02 61								
19																			1	.67 .0001 60		.41 .001 60	.26 .04 60					.30 .02 59
20																				1		.49 .0001 61						.37 .004 60
21																					1			.25 .05 61				
22																						1	.28 .03 61		.25 .05 61		.28 .03 60	.29 .02 60
23																							1					
24																								1	.68 .0001 61			
25																									1			
26																										1	.64 .0001 60	.27 .04 60
27																											1	.52 .0001 60
28																												1

Note: See Appendix - for a description of items. Numbers in the matrix represent the r, p, and n values for each pair of significant correlated items ($\alpha = .05$)